DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 888 CS 504 872

AUTHOR Tucker, Linda; And Others
TITLE Prospective Teachers' Use of Behavior Alteration Techniques: Reactions to Common Student Misbehaviors.
PUB DATE Feb 85
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Fresno, CA, February 16-19, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Classroom Techniques; Communication Problems; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; Curriculum; *Discipline; Elementary Secondary Education; Methods Courses; *Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Education; *Teacher Response; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Pertinent to potential recommendations for communication training in teacher preparation, a study investigated prospective teachers' intended use of communication control strategies in managing student misbehaviors. As an extension of previous instructional research, a typology of common student misbehavior types (active/passive) and intensity (moderate/severe) was formulated. The subjects, 115 elementary and secondary school prospective teachers, were asked to project their use of behavior alteration techniques (BATs) in four separate scenarios reflecting this typology. The results showed that the inexperienced teachers relied on only two strategies to modify student misbehavior--self-esteem and teacher feedback--regardless of misbehavior type or intensity. In addition, the results indicated that neither the student's gender nor the teacher's anticipated level of teaching meaningfully influenced reports of intended BAT use. The findings suggest that teacher preparation should provide preteachers with early experiences in actual classroom management so that they may be able to more successfully meet the professional demands for optimal classroom management. (EL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED254888

Prospective Teachers' Use of Behavior Alteration Techniques: Reactions to Common Student Misbehaviors

Linda Tucker

California State University, Sacramento

Timothy G. Plax

Rockwell International Corporation, Downey, CA

Patricia Kearney

California State University, Sacramento

Running Head: PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

Top 3 Paper presented at the Communication Theory & Research Interest Group of the Western Speech Communication Association conference, Fresno, CA, February, 1985.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda K. Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 204 872

Abstract

Pertinent to potential recommendations for communication training in teacher preparation, this study investigated prospective teachers' intended use of communication control strategies in managing student misbehaviors. As an extension of previous instructional research, a typlogy of common student misbehavior types (active/passive) and intensity (moderate/severe) was formulated. Prospective teachers were then asked to project their use of behavior alteration techniques (BATs) in four separate scenarios reflecting this typology. Results indicated that inexperienced teachers are likely to employ the same two BATs across all four scenarios, regardless of misbehavior type or intensity. Findings of this study and those which focus on experienced teachers are discussed in terms of teacher training in classroom management.

Prospective Teachers' Use of Behavior Alteration Techniques: Reactions to Common Student Misbehaviors

Instruction in today's schools has been notably restrained by widespread student resistance to learning and teacher authority (Boocock, 1983). Perhaps the most critical issue facing beginning teachers is student discipline. Cited as the number one problem in our public schools (Gallup, 1977, 1981), student discipline challenges even the most experienced teacher. Accountable to parental and administrative demands for student achievement (Spillman, 1980), the experienced teacher is well aware that all the training he/she has had in reading, writing and arithmetic is useless unless classroom control is maintained (Perry & Taylor, 1982).

To the inexperienced teacher, understanding pupil control can be crucial to success in teaching (Jones, 1982, p. 220). Nevertheless, teacher training programs typically de-emphasize those classroom management skills that should be requisite for teacher certification. As a result, the beginning teacher quickly discovers that he/she is ill-prepared to master the dynamics of actual classroom teaching. It is not altogether surprising then, that one out of three beginning teachers drop out of the teaching profession within the first three years (Mouly, 1973). These same "drop outs" cite discipline or lack of classroom management skills as their primary reason for leaving the teaching profession.

In a constructive approach to redefining teacher preparation, instructional communication researchers have isolated communication or control strategies which can contribute to a well-managed classroom (Kearney, Plax, Richmond & McCroskey, in press-a, in press-b). Following from this research perspective,

successful teaching involves influencing students to cooperate in the learning process. Beyond mastering course content and instructional methods then, teachers must learn to strategically communicate those messages that compel students to engage in learning. While previous research has examined experienced teachers' perceptions of classroom control, the present study focused on what prospective teachers report they would use to effectively manage or control student behaviors.

The Research Problem

This project was designed to explore the use of power strategies in the classroom in managing particular types of student misbehaviors. Power strategies allow the teacher to influence students to do something they would not have done had they not been influenced (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984). When teachers implement power by communicating the desired behavior and the reason or power base for compliance, they purposively attempt to change student behavior in the classroom. In this way, power strategies are critical for enhancing on-task behaviors requisite for learning.

Prior research has focused exclusively on experienced teachers' selective use of power in controlling student misbehaviors in the classroom (Kearney et al., in press-a, in press-b; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, 1984; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1984; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984; Wheeless, Stewart & Barraclough, 1983). Corresponding research has not been reported which examined prospective or inexperienced teachers' perceptions of power strategy use. However, the research on discipline or pupil control ideology has indicated that inexperienced teachers view classroom control differently from experienced teachers (e.g., Hoy, 1967, 1969; Jones, 1982). There is little reason to expect then, that inexperienced

teachers will report that they would use strategies similar to those of experienced teachers. In explanation, experienced teachers may rely on their "working knowledge" of those strategies that effectively manage actual student misbehaviors that are common to the traditional classroom. Lacking such a "working knowledge" or inadequate training in classroom management skills, pre-teachers may be limited in their understanding of those control techniques available and reported as effective. Pertinent to potential recommendations for communication training in teacher preparation, this study was designed to investigate prospective teachers' intended use of power strategies in managing those student misbheaviors cited as commonly occurring in the classroom.

Classroom Management and Teacher Power

During the last ten to fifteen years the instructional literature has focused on the systematic analysis of teacher behaviors that produce the effectively managed classroom. Prior to such investigations, the teacher often relied on the idiosyncratic advice provided by experienced teachers or psychological theories advanced outside the discipline of education (Brophy, 1983). Unfortunately, Brophy (1983) asserts that such advice was "unsystematic and often contradictory" and many of the theories were "incorrect or impractical for classroom use" (p. 265). Today, numerous investigators have identified a wide range of teacher behaviors that contribute to an effectively managed classroom.

Classroom management is defined as those teacher behaviors which "produce high levels of student involvement in classroom activities, minimal amounts of student behaviors that interfere with the teacher's or student's work, and efficient use of instructional time" (Emmer & Evertson, 1981, p. 342).

By effectively managing the classroom, time spend on academic tasks is maximized. Consequently, superior performance or learning is enhanced (Brophy, 1979, 1983; Good, 1979). While the emphasis imbedded within the classroom management perspective is that of preventing student misbehaviors from occurring in the first place (Brophy, 1983), there remains a large body of literature which is rooted in more traditional orientations toward classroom discipline. Management refers to student control as it directly relates to learning or on-task behaviors, whereas discipline emphasizes student disruptions or off-task behaviors. As such, discipline oftentimes becomes the optimal goal for effective teaching.

Within the traditional discipline orientation, two predominant pupil control ideologies emerge: custodialism and humanism (Hoy, 1967). Such ideologies are rooted in the perception that the public school is a unique type of service organization analogous to prisons and mental hospitals with respect to client selection.

> In each case, the organization has no choice in the selection of the clients and conversely, the clients have no choice in their participation in the organization. Furthermore, whether the organizational goal is education, treatment, or rehabilitation, the organization is of necessity dealing with some clients who have little or no desire to take advantage of the services rendered by the organization (Hoy, 1967, p. 153).

While no one denies important differences between the public school organization and these institutions, the classification of control ideology rests on those similaries observed among all three types of organizations. Recognizing that not all students are ready and willing participants in the learning process, many school systems have adopted the custodial pupil control ideology.

Custodialism refers to teacher as authority in the classroom. As such, the student is perceived as one who must submit to that authority. Such

well-defined role hierarchies emphasize teacher dominance, autocracy, and strict, unilateral teacher control (Hoy, 1967, 1968). In contrast, a humanistic control ideology stresses the importance of teacher confidence and trust toward students as individualized learners. Accordingly, the student is of primary concern; self-discipline and student responsibility are fostered. Unlike the custodial orientation which emphasizes punitive control, the humanistic orientation stresses supportive, helpful control techniques (Hoy, 1967, 1968).

According to Hoy (1967), teacher training programs typically socialize prospective teachers with "ideal images" of student behavior. Adopting a more permissive or humanistic ideology, student teachers often enter the classroom with unrealistic expectations: student control is simply a matter of creating an environment that meets each and every individual's needs. Employing an elementary and secondary student teacher sample, Hoy (1967) assessed pupil control ideologies prior to commencement of student teaching and again, at the conclusion of the student teaching experience. Results indicated that student teachers adopted a significantly stronger custodial pupil control ideology after student teaching than before.

Building upon earlier research, Hoy (1969) again tested the hypothesis that as teachers were absorbed into the public school organization, their pupil control ideology would become increasingly more custodial. Using a similar sample, Hoy assessed their pupil control ideology four times: prior to student teaching, at the conclusion of their student teaching experience, after their first year of teaching, and again, after their second year of teaching. Results indicated that teachers adopted a more custodial pupil control ideology after their student teaching and first-year teaching

experiences. Second-year teachers retained their custodial orientation.

Similarly, Roberts and Blankenship (1970) found that elementary student teachers modified their views of student control upon entering the classroom. Based on a sample of student teachers, these investigators obtained evidence for an increasing custodial orientation as a function of the student teaching experience. Most recently, Jones (1982) examined elementary and secondary student teachers' pupil control ideology at different intervals during their student teaching experience. Results indicated that student teachers adopted more custodial orientations during actual classroom teaching experiences at eight weeks and at sixteen weeks.

The results of these investigations suggest that inexperienced teachers are readily socialized into more custodial orientations, despite teacher training programs which advocate more humanistic student control ideologies. Interpreting the ideological change experienced by student teachers may very well reside with the public school socialization process. According to Hoy (1968), both administrators and experienced teachers alike frequently advocate a rigidly disciplined classroom. Quick to reprimand the beginning teacher's attempts at more permissive, humanistic control techniques, student teachers are encouraged to adopt a more custodial control ideology.

Most recently, a third perspective has emerged from the instructional communication literature which focuses on teacher power in the classroom (Kearney et al., in press-a, in press-b; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; McCroskey et al., 1984; Plax et al., 1984; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984). Merging both classroom management and discipline views, teacher power functions to elicit student on-task behaviors and discourage off-task behaviors. Teacher power in the classroom refers to the teacher's ability or potential to change or

modify student behaviors. Based on a theoretical framework provided by French and Raven (1968),[1] power is relationally defined by both the source of influence and the target. Consequently, teacher based power must be perceived to have influence potential.

While bases of power refer to the potential to affect change, power strategies involve the implementation of a specific power base (Wheeless et al., 1983). Strategies then, are techniques designed to illustrate power to the target. In the classroom, teacher power strategies are communicated by specific verbal and nonverbal messages. Such power-based messages are the means by which the power base is made known to the student. Such teacher influence attempts contribute to the teacher's ability to maximize student on-task behaviors and minimize student disruptions to learning.

Pertinent to the present project, Kearney et al. (in press-a, in press-b) examined both strategies and messages representative of the original bases of power. The end result of this research was a typology of actual strategies and sample messages teachers reported they used in managing the classroom. Such Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) and representative Behavior Alteration Messages (BAMs) were then given to a sample of experienced elementary and secondary teachers in order to assess use and perceived effectiveness in managing student behavior. While these teachers perceived they employed primarily reward-type or prosocial BATs, they reported that their colleagues used additional punishment or anti-social BATs. Assuming that teachers may be unwilling to report using anti-social control techniques, the results of this investigation indicate that they may very well use a variety of both pro and anti-social BATs. Consistent with the custodial model of classroom discipline (Hoy, 1968), the selective use of these particular anti-social

BATs reflect legitimate-based power or teacher authority.

The Kearney et al. studies suggest that experienced teachers' report handling student misbehaviors by employing a variety of behavior alteration techniques. Their investigations focused on experienced teachers' perception of BAT use across behaviors generally. In extension, this study examined prospective teachers' perceptions of BAT use as a function of specific misbehaviors that commonly occur in the classroom.

A Typology of Student Misbehaviors

Encompassing a wide range of behaviors which are potentially operative in the classroom, student misbehavior refers to any action that interferes with the learning process (Richmond & Andriate, 1982). In an effort to delineate precisely the construct of misbehavior, Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper (1971) discuss the range of student behaviors on a continuum of more constructive, useful behaviors to more destructive, useless behaviors. Constructive behaviors may include those that elicit teacher perceptions of "model" students. Consequently, constructive student behaviors in the classroom environment are typically interpreted by teachers as "on-task" behaviors. In contrast, destructive behaviors may elicit teacher perceptions of "problem" students. Pertinent to a classification of student misbehavior then, are those off-task or destructive behaviors.

Dreikurs et al. (1971) further classify destructive behaviors as either active or passive. Active destructive behaviors are those that overtly operate to disrupt learning, whereas passive destructive behaviors are generally covert or suspended. By example, active misbehaviors include talking out-of-turn, stealing, bullying and shouting. Passive misbehaviors include refusing to do homework or to engage in group tasks, unwillingness to attend to lectures,

or truancy. Both types of misbehaviors, whether active or passive destructive, interfere with in-class learning.

In identifying commonly occurring misbehavior types, Bellon, Doek and Handler (1979) surveyed approximately 4,000 public school administrators and experienced teachers as to actual misbehavior problems experienced in the classroom. Based on responses across all grade levels (K-12), two passive destructive and two active destructive behaviors were ranked as frequent and common concerns of more than half of the respondents. Active misbehaviors included talking out-of-turn (cited by 78.0 percent of the respondents) and overactive behavior in the classroom (70.8 percent). Passive behaviors included inattention to lesson (cited by 81.9 percent of the respondents) and apathetic behavior (50.4 percent). These findings provide empirical support for the existence of a typology of student misbehavior problems in the classroom.

It appears then, that common student misbehaviors include both active and passive destructive types. Dreikurs et al. (1971) assert that active misbehaviors are typically easier to control than passive misbehaviors. While active misbehaviors may be more immediately disruptive to the entire classroom environment and thus, more irritating to the teacher, such behaviors are also easily recognizable as destructive. Consequently, an effective teacher may be compelled to employ a variety of desist strategies. In contrast, passive misbehaviors may not be readily identified as destructive and as a result, may be maintained indefinitely without immediate teacher attempts at behavior change. In addition, moving a passive misbehavior (e.g., apathy) to an active, constructive behavior is more difficult to achieve than desisting an active misbehavior (Dreikurs et al., 1971).

Managing student behaviors in the classroom then, may require differential use of control strategies as a function of misbehavior type (i.e., active or passive). Certainly the selective use of control techniques relies on the special characteristics of the learner. While the overall goals of managing student behaviors are the same, "the specific methods used to accomplish these goals may differ somewhat" (Brophy, 1983, p. 282). For instance, Brophy (1983) suggests that distractible students may require quiet places to maintain on-task activities; slower students may need individualized or personalized teacher tutoring; and poor workers may demand individualized teacher reinforcement and programmatic instruction.

Similarly, the intensity of misbehavior type may require specific control strategies for management. Misbehaviors which have developed into more long-term learning problems as opposed to short-term, transitional problems may prompt different types of teacher attempts to control. Students who have a history of apathy toward school (i.e., passive) or who continually disrupt the teacher and the class with their overactivity (i.e., active) may require different management techniques than those students who occasionally talk out-of-turn (i.e., active) or are inattentive to specific teacher talk (i.e., passive).

Research Questions

Previous research on discipline or student control in the classroom indicates that prospective or inexperienced teachers view classroom control differently from experienced teachers. Experienced teachers are described as being typically more custodial in their classroom orientations whereas inexperienced teachers are discussed as being more permissive and humanistic in their control of students. Following this thinking, it is argued that teacher

training programs socialize prospective teachers with "ideal images" of student behaviors and thus, student teachers often enter the classroom with unrealistic expectations. Moreover, inexperienced teachers have not had to integrate into the traditionally custodial classroom orientations which are predominant in numerous educational organizations. Because of this lack of instructional experience, prospective teachers may promote a humanistic ideology by indicating that they would employ more prosocial or reward-type control techniques in managing student misbehaviors. In addition, such inexperience may lead pre-teachers to report that they would use fewer strategies than would normally be expected by experienced classroom teachers. Therefore,

> Research Question 1: Which behavior alteration techniques (BATs) do prospective teachers report they would use most and least frequently in controlling common student misbehaviors in the classroom?

While the control ideology may influence generalized use of particular control strategies, research has not focused on inexperienced teachers' employment of communication techniques for handling specific student misbehaviors. When confronted with actual classroom situations of student misbehaviors common to the classroom, inexperienced teachers may report the use of different control strategies than those techniques confined to and representative of a humanistic control ideology. Furthermore, pre-teachers' selection of control techniques may be contingent upon active/passive misbehavior types (Dreikurs et al., 1971) and variations in misbehavior intensity (e.g., Brophy, 1983). Thus,

> Research Question 2: To what extent do prospective teachers' perceptions of projected BAT usage vary as a function of misbehavior type (active/passive) and/or intensity (moderate/severe)?

Extending the reasoning of research question two, it would seem that when prospective teachers are asked to speculate about their handling of specific student misbehaviors, their decisions would be influenced by the

particular student to which they were reacting. How students' behaviors are perceived by teachers may be determined in part, by the sex of the particular student. Because elementary and secondary teachers typically face classrooms composed of both male and female students, it is appropriate to determine whether prospective teachers perceive that they employ different strategies to control misbehaviors as a function of student gender. As in research question two, both type and intensity of misbehaviors were considered. Therefore,

> Research Question 3: To what extent do prospective teachers' perceptions of projected BAT usage vary as a function of male as opposed to female student misbehaviors?

Furthermore, since it has been argued that prospective teachers may report differential use of behavior alteration techniques as a function of student sex and type or intensity of misbehavior, it is also reasonable to assume that particularly relevant teacher variables would impact projected classroom management decisions. More specifically, Kearney et al. (in press-b) found grade level taught to be a significant predictor of selective BAT use for experienced teachers. Teachers in upper grade levels reported employing more anti-social (i.e., punishment) and expert-based BATs while teachers in lower grades reported the use of more prosocial BATs. Consequently, the fourth and final research question was asked in an attempt to determine whether prospective teachers' anticipated grade level enters into decisions about the management of particular student misbehaviors. Similar to research questions two and three, both type and intensity of misbehaviors were considered. Thus,

> Research Question 4: To what extent do prospective teachers' perceptions of projected BAT usage vary as a function of anticipated level of teaching?

Methods

Subjects

Subjects consisted of 115 (males = 10, females = 105) prospective teachers finishing their major in secondary or elementary education at a large West Coast university. Fifty-two of the participants were preparing to teach grades K-3; 40 for grades 4-6; 3 for 7-9; 13 for 10-12; and 7 were preparing to teach across grade levels (e.g., special education, physical education). The teacher preparation curriculum for this sample included only minimal exposure to classroom management techniques. Content courses required for teacher certification reflected typical courses in theory, instructional methods, and specialized content areas (e.g., history, math, English). All Ss had limited experience in actual classroom teaching and were close to entering their final semester of student teaching prior to certification.

Procedures

Participants were asked to complete a packet of survey materials which included an assessment of their expected teaching grade level and four student misbehavior scenarios followed by questionnaires tapping intended BAT use.

Insert Figure 1 and Table 1 about here

A cover letter accompanied each set of survey materials explaining that the purpose of the study was to examine pre-teachers' use of management techniques in the classroom. As approved by the Human Subjects Committee at the university from which the sample was drawn, Ss were assured that their participation was voluntary and all responses would remain anonymous.

Stimulus Materials

As a stimulus for S responses, four different student misbehavior scenarios were provided to each S. The four scenarios were written to reflect the following

criteria: First, each misbehavior must be a "common" problem that both elementary and secondary teachers face in classroom management. Bellon et al. (1979) found that teachers in grades K-12 indicated the four most common misbehaviors of concern were inattention, apathy, talking out-of-turn, and overactive behavior. The four scenarios were written to reflect these common or frequent misbehaviors. Second, consistent with the active/passive paradigm advanced by Dreikurs et al. (1971), misbehavior scenarios should reflect both types. Critical to this distinction, two of the most commonly occurring misbehaviors noted by Bellon et al. (1979) reflect an active type (talking out-of-turn and overactive behavior) and two reflect a passive type (inattention and apathy).

Third, each scenario should vary in misbehavior intensity. Assuming misbehavior intensity is associated with differential use of behavior control strategies, each scenario was written to reflect either severe or moderate intensity. Both apathy and overactivity have long-term consequences to student or peer learning disruptions, whereas inattention and talking out-of-turn are typically associated with short-term consequences. As a result, apathy and overactivity were labeled severe, whereas inattention and talking out-of-turn were labeled moderate misbehavior intensities. Consequently, scenarios were written to reflect more long-term misbehaviors (severe) as well as more occasional misbehaviors (moderate). Fourth, consistent with the definition of classroom management (Emmer & Evertson, 1981) and misbehavior (Richmond & Andriate, 1982), each misbehavior scenario needed to reflect "off-task" student behaviors. Fifth, each scenario had to permit the use of all 22 BATs. Finally, each scenario must reflect universal misbehaviors applicable to to grades K-12 (see Figure 1).[2] Subjects were then instructed to "imagine

that the student in each situation is in the grade level you expect to teach."

In order to ensure that each scenario reflected mixed-gender student roles, in addition to active/passive misbehavior types and moderate/severe misbehavior intensities, all Ss responded to two male and two female students engaging in one of four scenarios. Gender roles were rotated for each of the four scenarios so that one-half of the Ss (N = 60) received male passive-severe, female active-moderate, male active-severe and female passive-moderate, while the other half (N = 55) received female passive-severe, male active-moderate, female active-severe and male passive-moderate.

Measuring Instrument

Following each stimulus behavior scenario, Ss were provided with separate sets of behavior alteration messages (BAMs) representing each of the twenty-two BATs generated by Kearney et al. (in press-b). BAT labels were not included on the questionnaire. Subjects were asked to rate on a 1 - 7 scale "how likely you would be to use each of the 22 message-based categories to influence the particular student in that situation." Higher scores indicated greater likelihood of use. Subjects responded to the questionnaire four times, assessing their likelihood of use for each of the four misbehavior scenarios. The BAT instrument was originally designed to reflect the independence of the 22 separate sets of message groupings. Based on data obtained from both experienced teachers across all grade levels (Kearney et al., in press-a, in press-b) and their students (McCroskey et al., 1984), no meaningful underlying factor structures have been obtained. Consistent with previous research then, answering each of the four questions in the present study was approached assuming that the BAT instrument represented 22 relatively independent message categories.

Results

In order to answer research question one, frequency analysis was performed to determine the percentage of pre-teachers reporting high (5, 6 or 7) and low (1, 2 or 3) projected use for each BAT. Employing a majority percentage criterion, the same two BATs were reported to be most frequently used across all four common misbehavior scenarios: Self-Esteem (BAT #5) and Teacher Feedback (BAT #22). Employing the same criterion, all other 20 BATs were reported as infrequently used. Thus, these results indicate that

Insert Table 2 about here

pre-teachers reported a likelihood of only limited use of the variety of available BATs and of those most likely to be used, only the Self-Esteem BAT reflected a prosocial technique.

Research question two was answered by probing potential BAT use differences across the four misbehavior scenarios. Two separate multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were computed. The first MANOVA compared all 22 BATs as a function of misbehavior type (active versus passive); the second MANOVA compared all 22 BATs as a function of misbehavior intensity (moderate versus severe). Because Ss responded to two active and two passive misbehavior scenarios, response totals ranged from 2 (least likely to be used) to 14 (most likely to be used). This same additive procedure was employed for subjects' responses to the two moderate and two severe misbehavior scenarios.

For the active versus passive condition, the resulting multivariate F statistic was nonsignificant (Wilks' Lambda = .857, F = 1.55, df = 22/205, $p > .05$). Because available power analysis techniques exclude multivariate designs (Garrison & Andersen, 1979), no power estimates are reported for the MANOVAs employed in answering the questions of the present study.

Normally, finding a nonsignificant multivariate F would preclude computing follow-up univariate contrasts. However, because of the exploratory nature of this study, post hoc tests were also computed. Power estimates for each of the univariate contrasts conducted was .77 for a medium effect size at alpha = .05 (Cohen, 1977). Three BATs differed significantly by active/passive misbehavior type: Deferred Reward from Behavior (BAT #2, $F = 6.86$, $df = 1/226$, $R^2 = .03$, $p < .005$), Altruism (BAT #18, $F = 5.49$, $df = 1/226$, $R^2 = .02$, $p < .05$), and Teacher Feedback (BAT #22, $F = 6.36$, $df = 1/226$, $R^2 = .03$, $p < .01$). An examination of the means for each of these BATs suggested that for Deferred Reward from Behavior, prospective teachers reported greater likelihood of use with active ($\bar{X} = 6.78$) than with passive ($\bar{X} = 5.62$) misbehaviors. For Altruism, teachers reported greater likelihood of use with passive ($\bar{X} = 6.94$) than with active ($\bar{X} = 5.86$). For Teacher Feedback, teachers reported greater likelihood of use with active ($\bar{X} = 10.38$) than with passive ($\bar{X} = 9.13$). Because of the number of comparisons computed as well as the low obtained variances accounted for, these differences were interpreted as spurious and thus, not meaningful.

For the moderate versus severe condition, the resulting multivariate F statistic was nonsignificant (Wilks' Lambda = .877, $F = 1.31$, $df = 22/205$, $p > .05$). Follow-up univariate contrasts indicated that none of the 22 BATs differed as a function of moderate/severe misbehavior intensity. Consequently, prospective teachers' selection of BAT use does not appear to be a function of either type (active versus passive) or intensity (moderate versus severe) of misbehavior for those scenarios included in this study.

In order to answer research question three, multivariate analyses of variance were computed comparing all 22 BATs as a function of student gender for each of the four misbehavior scenarios. All four MANOVAs were nonsignificant:

Passive-severe, Wilks' Lambda = .835, F = .83, df = 22/92, $p > .05$; active-moderate, Wilks' Lambda = .819, F = .92, df = 22/92, $p > .05$; active-severe, Wilks' Lambda = .789, F = 1.10, df = 22/91, $p > .05$; passive-moderate, Wilk's Lambda = .793, F = 1.08, df = 22/91, $p > .05$. All follow-up contrasts were also nonsignificant ($p > .05$). Power estimates for each of the contrasts conducted was .77 for a medium effect size at alpha = .05. Consequently, research question 3 can be answered by asserting that prospective teachers' likelihood of selective BAT use does not appear to be a function of students' gender.

Research question four was answered by examining differences in BAT usage as a function of anticipated level of teaching (i.e., K-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12, "other"). MANOVAs were computed on prospective teacher responses to each of the scenarios on all 22 BATs. All four MANOVAs were nonsignificant: Passive-severe, Wilks' Lambda = .417, F = 1.00, df = 88/354, $p > .05$; active-moderate, Wilks' Lambda = .383, F = 1.11, df = 88/354, $p > .05$; active-severe, Wilks' Lambda = .419, F = .98, df = 88/350, $p > .05$; passive-moderate, Wilks' Lambda = .360, F = 1.17, df = 88/350, $p > .05$. Follow-up contrasts indicated that two BATs differed significantly for the passive-severe condition as a function of anticipated level of teaching: Deferred Reward from Behavior (BAT #2, F = 2.72, df = 4/110, R^2 = .09, $p < .05$) and Expert Teacher (BAT #21, F = 2.74, df = 4/110, R^2 = .09, $p < .05$). An examination of the individual means suggested that 4-6 prospective teachers (N = 40, $\bar{X}$ = 4.25) reported greater likelihood of use of Deferred Reward than K-3 pre-teachers (N = 52, $\bar{X}$ = 3.13). For Expert Teacher, greater likelihood of use was reported by 4-6 ($\bar{X}$ = 3.50) and 10-12 (N = 13, $\bar{X}$ = 4.15) prospective teachers than K-3 ($\bar{X}$ = 2.62).

Follow-up contrasts for the active-moderate condition were all non-significant. For the active-severe condition, only one BAT was significant:

Deferred Reward from Behavior (BAT #2, $\underline{F}$ = 2.42, $\underline{df}$ = 4/109, $\underline{R}^2$ = .08, $\underline{p} < .05$). Individual means indicated that 4-6 prospective teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 3.48) reported greater likelihood of use of Deferred Reward than K-3 teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 2.45). For the passive-moderate condition, only one BAT was significant: Expert Teacher (BAT #21, $\underline{F}$ = 2.45, $\underline{df}$ = 4/109, $\underline{R}^2$ = .08, $\underline{p} < .05$). Individual means indicated that 10-12 ($\bar{X}$ = 3.77) and "other" ($\underline{N}$ = 7, $\bar{X}$ = 4.00) prospective teachers reported greater likelihood of use of Expert Teacher than K-3 teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 2.38). The power estimate(s) for the follow-up contrasts conducted under research question four was .54 for a medium effect size at alpha = .05.

Although interesting, the results of the univariate and contrasts tests are limited. Because of the number of comparisons computed as well as the low obtained variances accounted for, any significant differences were interpreted as spurious and thus, not meaningful. In total then, the data pertinent to research question 4 would suggest that expected teaching level does not appear to contribute meaningfully to prospective teachers' decisions about BAT use for controlling those specific student misbehaviors illustrated in the scenarios in this study.

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicate that prospective teachers reported limited use of the variety of behavior alteration techniques available in controlling particular student misbehaviors in the classroom. Regardless of misbehavior type (active/passive) or intensity (moderate/severe), this sample of inexperienced teachers projected a reliance on only two strategies to modify student misbehaviors: Self-Esteem and Teacher Feedback. An examination of each of these BATs perceived as most likely to be used reflects

a humanistic control orientation or a teacher-based appeal for evaluation. Consistent with previous research on inexperienced teachers' preference for a humanistic control ideology, the Self-Esteem BAT demonstrates teacher concern for the student. Appealing to the student's sense of self-worth, the inexperienced teacher attempts to gain compliance by positively reinforcing the student's special qualities (e.g., "You're good at it"). While not categorized as particularly prosocial or anti-social, the intended use of Teacher Feedback reflects the task-oriented objectives of the prospective teacher. Calling attention to learning goals, the inexperienced teacher attempts to gain compliance by asserting his/her need to evaluate the student's performance (e.g., "Because I need to know how well you understand this").

Similarly, experienced teachers have also reported the frequent use of these same two BATs (e.g., Kearney et al., in press-b). Unlike experienced teachers and their students' perceptions, however, this sample of prospective teachers fails to rely on the variety of other BATs which have been shown to be positively associated with cognitive and affective learning outcomes (McCroskey et al., 1984) and effective classroom control (Kearney et al., in press-a; in press-b). Instead, these pre-teachers reported infrequent use of all other twenty BATs. While several of the available BATs are negatively associated with learning and management effectiveness, the prospective teachers also deny the intended use of numerous strategies perceived as effective by experienced teachers and their students.

Anticipating selective BAT use as a function of misbehavior type and/or intensity, these results indicate that prospective teachers indiscriminately rely on the intended use of the same two BATs (e.g., Self-Esteem and Teacher Feedback) across all four misbehaviors. Perhaps this sample of inexperienced

teachers lack sufficient training in the use of a diversity of effective classroom management techniques. Moreover, the paucity of "actual" classroom experience may preclude expanded perceptions of employing different BATs with selective student misbehaviors. Not having had sufficient classroom experiences with these commonly occurring misbehaviors, the prospective teacher may be unaware of the presumed necessity to employ a greater diversity of techniques. In addition, pre-teachers may be more conservative in their willingness to "try out" a variety of selected control strategies. Finally, while these misbehavior scenarios represent those student misbehaviors which are most common to the classroom (Bellon et al., 1979), inexperienced teachers may not be familiar with any or all of those misbehavior types or intensities. Consequently, pre-teachers may idealistically treat all student misbehaviors similarly. If we can assume that this sample of pre-teachers are "trained" and about to enter the classroom, the results of this investigation suggest that these prospective teachers are not yet realistically qualified to meet the challenges of actual classroom management.

These results further indicate that neither student's gender nor teacher's anticipated level of teaching meaningfully influenced reports of intended selective BAT use. Perhaps prospective teachers are not affected by potential sex-role stereotypes of student misbehaviors, or pre-teachers are unwilling to report discriminative use of BATs on students as a function of gender. Interpreting the findings relative to anticipated grade level of teaching is even more troublesome. In research reported on experienced teachers' perceptions of BAT use in the classroom, grade level appears to be associated with the selective use of BATs (Kearney et al., in press-b). While the literature suggests that experienced teachers would manage small

children differently than young adults (e.g., Brophy, 1983), these prospective teachers reported a restricted reliance on the same two BATs across all grade levels. Once again, inexperienced teachers may not understand the demands of actual classroom management that have been demonstrated to be specifically tied to grade-level.

A number of studies are underway which will help to further sort out the interpretations of the findings of the present study. Specifically, the second investigation in this line of research focuses on experienced teachers' perceptions of selective BAT use as a function of misbehavior type and/or intensity, student gender, and grade level taught. Predicting that BAT use will differ substantially as a function of these variables for experienced classroom teachers, more precise recommendations can be made for teacher training programs. So far, these data tentatively indicate that teacher preparation should provide pre-teachers with early experiences in actual classroom management. Faced with commonly occurring misbehaviors (as reflected in the scenarios), prospective teachers may more realistically understand the dynamics involved in student control. Supplementing such "in-service" training with coursework on those available control strategies determined to be associated with learning outcomes and management effectiveness, prospective teachers may be able to more successfully integrate within the elementary and secondary organization. Noting that teachers are often retained or tenured on their abilities to effectively manage students in the classroom (Hoy, 1968), the entry-level teacher may be better equipped to meet such professional demands for optimal classroom management.

References

Brophy, J. E. (1979). Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 733-750.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Classroom organization and management. Elementary School Journal, 83, 265-285.

Bellon, J. J., Doek, E. D., & Handler, J. R. (1979). A study of school discipline in Tennessee. (Report No. EA-013-864). Knoxville, Tenn.: The University of Tennessee, College of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 151)

Boocock, S. (1983). Public schools and education. In M. L. DeFleur (Ed.), Social problems in American society (pp. 388-419). Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., & Pepper, F. C. (1971). Maintaining sanity in the classroom: Illustrated teaching techniques. New York: Harper & Row.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 38, 342-347.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1968). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (2nd ed.) (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Garrison, J. P., & Andersen, P. A. (1979). A reassessment of statistical power analysis in Human Communication Research. Human Communication Research, 5, 343-350.

Gallup, G. H. (1977). Ninth annual Gallup poll: What does the public think of the school? Today's Education, 66, 27-31.

Gallup, G. F. (1981). The 13th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 33-47.

Good, T. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: What we know about it now. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-64.

Hoy, W. K. (1967). Organizational socialization: The student teacher and pupil control ideology. Journal of Educational Research, 61, 153-155.

Hoy, W. K. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76, 312-323.

Hoy, W. K. (1969). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 77, 257-265.

Jones, D. R. (1982). The influence of length and level of student teaching on pupil control ideology. High School Journal, 66, 220-225.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (in press-a). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Communication Education.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, v. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (in press-b). Power in the classroom IV: Alternatives to discipline. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 8. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. Communication Education, 32, 176-184.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1984). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training, and learning. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Mouly, G. J. (1973). Psychology for effective teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Perry, F., & Taylor, H. (1982). Needed: A methods course in discipline for pre-service teachers. Education, 102, 416-419.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P. (1984). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. Unpublished manuscript.

Richmond, V. P., & Andriate, G. (1982). Advanced study: Instructional communication. Morgantown, WV: Department of Speech Communication, West Virginia University.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom II: Power and learning. Communication Education, 33, 125-136.

Roberts, R. A., & Blankenship, J. W. (1970). The relationship between the change in pupil control ideology of student teachers and the student teacher's perception of the cooperating teacher's pupil control ideology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7, 315-320.

Spillman, C. V. (1980). Classroom management: Mystery or mastery? Education, 101, 41-45.

Wheeless, L. R., Barraclough R., & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in persuasion. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 7 (pp. 105-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Footnotes

[1]McCroskey and Richmond (1983) interpreted this conceptualization of power bases in their research on power in the classroom. Teacher coercive power is based on student perceptions that he/she will be punished by the teacher if he/she fails to conform to the teacher's influence attempt. Teacher's reward power refers to student expectations that he/she will be rewarded (positive or negative reinforcement) if he/she complies with the teacher's influence attempt. Legitimate or assigned power is based on student perceptions of the teacher's right to make demands. Referent power is based on the student's desire to comply with the teacher's influence attempt in order to please or identify with the teacher. Finally, expert power is based on the student's willingness to comply because the teacher is perceived as competent and knowledgeable in specific areas.

[2]In order to determine the perceived realism of each scenario, experienced teachers (N = 94) from grades K-12 enrolled in graduate courses in communication in the classroom were asked to indicate whether they felt each situation was common to their classroom experiences. Without exception, all respondents reported that all four scenarios reflected both realistic and common student misbehaviors.

Table 1

BAMs	BATs
1. Immediate Reward from Behavior	You will enjoy it. It will make you happy. Because it's fun. You'll find it rewarding/interesting. It's a good experience.
2. Deferred Reward	It will help you later on in life. It will prepare you for college (or high school, job, etc.) It will prepare you for you achievement tests. It will help you with upcoming assignments.
3. Reward from Teacher	I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you. I will give you a good grade (or recess, extra credit) if you do. I will make you my special assistant.
4. Reward from Others	Others will respect you if you do. Others will be proud of you. Your friends will like you if you do. Your parents will be pleased.
5. Self-Esteem	You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You are good at it. You always do such a good job. Because you capable!
6. Punishment from Behavior	You will lose if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't. It's your loss. You'll feel bad if you don't.
7. Punishment from Teacher	I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you. I'll give you an "F" if you don't. If you don't do it now, it will be homework tonight.
8. Punishment from Others	No one will like you. Your friends will make fun of you. Your parents will punish you if you don't. Your classmates will reject you.
9. Guilt	If you don't, others will be hurt. You'll make others unhappy if you don't. Your parents will feel bad if you don't. Others will be punished if you don't.
10. Teacher/Student Relationship: Positive	I will like you better if you do. I will respect you. I will think more highly of you. I will appreciate you more if you do. I will be proud of you.
11. Teacher/Student Relationship: Negative	I will dislike you if you don't. I will lose respect for you. I will think less of you if you don't. I won't be proud of you. I'll be disappointed in you.

12.	Legitimate-Higher Authority	Do it, I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. It's a school rule. It's school policy. The principal said so.
13.	Legitimate-Teacher Authority	Because I told you to. You don't have a choice. You're here to work! I'm the teacher, you're the student. I'm in charge, not you. Don't ask, just do it.
14.	Personal (Student) Responsibility	It is your obligation. It is your turn. Everyone has to do his/her share. It's your job. Everyone has to pull his/her own weight.
15.	Responsibility to Class	Your group needs it done. The class depends on you. All your friends are counting on you. Don't let your group down. You'll ruin it for the rest of the class (team).
16.	Normative Rules	We voted, and the majority rules. All of your friends are doing it. Everyone else has to do it. The rest of the class is doing it. It's part of growing up.
17.	Debt	You owe me one. Pay your debt. You promised to do it. I did it the last time. you said you'd try this time.
18.	Altruism	If you do this it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do. I'm not asking you to do it for yourself; do it for the good of the class.
19.	Peer Modeling	Your friends do it. Classmates you respect do it. The friends you admire do it. Other students you like do it. All your friends are doing it.
20.	Teacher Modeling	This is the way I always do it. When I was your age, I did it. People who are like me do it. I had to do this when I was in school. Teachers you respect do it.
21.	Expert Teacher	From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has always worked for me. Trust me - I know what I'm doing. I had to do this before I became a teacher.
22.	Teacher Feedback	Because I need to know how well you understand this. To see how well I've taught you. To see how wellk you can do it. It will help me know your problem areas.

Figure 1.
Student Misbehavior Scenarios

Passive/Severe

Situation 1: *Linda is completely turned off by school. She sits passively in class each day, making little or no effort to participate in class or do homework. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies in order to get Linda to more actively contribute and work on class assignments? (Note: Use 7 to equal Extremely Likely and 1 to equal Extremely Unlikely).

Active/Moderate

Situation 2: Jim loves to chatter with his friends any time he gets the chance. His talking frequently interrupts class lessons and distracts others. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies to get Jim to work constructively on the class assignment?

Active/Severe

Situation 3: Pam is typically restless and overactive in class. She dominates the class by asking a lot of questions and seems argumentative. Her behavior is often distracting to you, the class, and the task. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies in order to get Pam to settle down and work constructively in class on the assignment? (Note: Use 7 to equal Extremely Likely and 1 to equal Extremely Unlikely).

Passive/Moderate

Situation 4: Mike fails to pay attention to your lectures and instructions. He doesn't disturb others, but neither does he listen actively to you. Instead, he may be writing notes, doodling, or daydreaming. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies to get Mike to pay attention and work on the task?

---

*In order to rotate student gender roles, each scenario was rewritten to substitute Bill for Linda, Virginia for Jim, Tim for Pam, and Carolyn for Mike.

Table 2
Means and Frequency Percentages for Projected use on Each of the Four Misbehavior Scenarios

BAT*	Scenario 1 (Passive/Severe) Use %			Scenario 2 (Active/Moderate) Use %			Scenario 3 (Active/Severe) Use %			Scenario 4 (Passive/Moderate) Use %		
	$\bar{X}$	High	Low	$\bar{X}$	High	Low	$\bar{X}$	High	Low	$\bar{X}$	High	Low
1	3.3	27	58	3.1	31	60	3.1	27	61	3.6	39	50
2	3.6	33	49	2.7	20	64	2.9	25	63	3.2	28	54
3	3.2	25	62	2.7	20	71	3.1	30	56	3.4	33	53
4	3.0	24	62	2.8	21	65	2.9	23	62	2.9	25	64
5	5.2	70	20	4.5	53	34	4.7	64	28	4.7	66	29
6	1.9	10	84	1.9	8	84	2.0	11	81	2.1	12	76
7	1.7	4	90	1.8	6	88	1.7	6	89	1.6	6	91
8	1.3	3	95	1.3	3	97	1.5	6	91	1.3	2	97
9	1.8	7	91	2.2	12	78	1.9	7	87	1.8	7	92
10	2.6	16	72	2.6	19	72	2.6	21	71	2.5	18	73
11	1.4	4	94	1.4	4	94	1.3	3	94	1.3	3	94
12	2.2	11	83	1.9	7	87	1.8	6	90	1.7	5	90
13	2.1	15	84	2.1	10	83	2.1	13	79	1.9	11	84
14	3.5	34	50	3.4	33	47	3.3	32	52	3.2	25	54
15	3.3	29	53	3.5	35	48	3.4	37	51	3.2	29	54
16	3.1	23	62	3.0	27	63	3.1	31	59	2.8	18	62
17	1.8	7	89	1.6	6	91	1.7	7	90	1.7	4	88
18	2.8	20	67	3.6	37	50	3.8	31	53	3.0	28	59
19	3.0	24	62	3.2	28	59	3.2	30	59	2.9	25	62
20	1.8	5	85	2.1	10	79	2.2	10	80	2.4	16	73
21	3.2	28	59	3.1	30	58	2.9	25	64	2.9	24	62
22	5.5	80	13	4.6	56	29	4.5	58	30	4.9	65	27
Overall												
	2.8	22.7	67.5	2.7	21.6	68.2	2.7	22.9	67.7	2.7	22.2	67.4

*See Table 1 for category labels.